

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. III, No. 10

P.O. Box 21123, Washington, D.C. 20009

May 15, 1973

Nixon Aides Attack Basic Research System

Investigator-initiated research and the peer review system by which it is judged are currently the object of a quiet but intense attack by powerful officials in the Nixon administration.

The critics of such research include no less a potentate than HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger. And the challenge to the peer review system has been made in a secret document prepared by the increasingly powerful Office of Management and Budget.

At a May 3 luncheon meeting with selected journalists, Weinberger was questioned about a variety of topics, ranging from national politics to the administration of HEW. His views on the Watergate scandal captured most of the journalistic attention, but almost unnoticed were some revealing comments he made concerning the health research enterprise.

As Weinberger described it, the Nixon administration believes there has been too much undirected basic research; it is consequently trying to "redress the balance" by moving away from research that is initiated by an investigator, such as most of the basic research supported by grants from NIH and NIMH, and toward research directed at specific objectives, such as a cure for cancer or heart disease.

NAE Backs off from NAS Split

The National Academy of Engineering appears to have backtracked just a bit from its once-adamant determination to split off from the National Academy of Sciences.

In March, the NAE council, the organization's governing board, voted unanimously to recommend to its membership that the NAE be incorporated independently of NAS.

But at the organization's annual meeting on May 3, the membership watered down the Council's resolution to make possible less drastic action. Instead of "directing" the Council to seek separate incorporation, the membership simply "authorized" the Council to prepare such a plan. The membership also asked the Council to prepare "at least two options for action."

Thus the way is open for something less than total divorce, though the odds remain high that the NAE will become essentially independent.

"There has been too much emphasis on investigator-initiated research and not enough on directed research," Weinberger reportedly told the newsmen. Then he added this admonition for the scientific community: "If you are going to go to the government for these funds, you are going to have to accept the fact that government and Congress can direct the way it is going to be spent."

Weinberger noted that leaders of the scientific community "have fought us on this" and he added: "It does represent some change for the government to say we are not just funding all applications that come in, but we are trying to

(Continued on page 2)

In Brief

A nationwide competition for the first materials research laboratory to be established with government assistance in over a decade has been won by the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, which has been awarded a renewable, one-year \$225,000 NSF grant for fundamental research in polymer materials. NSF currently supports 12 other materials labs at universities throughout the country.

Glenn E. Schweitzer, director of the Office of Science and Technology of the Agency for International Development, has been appointed director of the Office of Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency. Schweitzer formerly was on the staff of the National Council of Marine Resource and Engineering Development in the Executive Office of the President and prior to that was science attache in Moscow.

The next meeting of the Joint US-USSR Commission on Science and Technology has been scheduled for November in Moscow.

Pigs grow faster in the presence of music, according to the Kansas State Experimental Station, and "music of the 1930's and 1940's produces the best results," it is reported in the May 4 Experiment Station Letter of the Cooperative State Research Service.

US cigarette consumption in 1972 totaled 565 billion, and total tobacco sales amounted to \$13.5 billion, according to the Tobacco Institute. Meanwhile, HEW is cutting its anti-smoking education budget to below \$1 million.

Research System (Continued from page 1)

focus funds in the greatest areas of need." He was apparently not challenged on his implication that the government had previously been funding "all applications that come in" from the scientific community.

According to the notes of one journalist who was present, Weinberger also put down the scientific community in words that went roughly as follows: "Some scientists would prefer to have money to stumble on to something. Well, that's fine, but we can't just stumble on to something all the time. We need to have focused, directed research."

The challenge to the peer review system—that

NAS Opens Forum Series

The National Academy of Sciences has inaugurated a series of public forums designed to promote expression and expert cross-examination of diverse opinions on major public policy issues involving science and technology.

The first, convening on May 15, is on the subject of "How Safe is Safe? The Design of Policy on Drugs and Food Additives." The participants are: James S. Turner, founder and co-director of Consumer Action for Improved Food and Drugs, "speaking for the consumer"; W. Clarke Wescoe, vice chairman of the board and director of Sterling Drug, Inc., "speaking for the producer"; Joshua Lederberg, chairman of the Department of Genetics, Stanford Medical School, "speaking for the scientist-developer"; Oliver H. Lowry, head of the Department of Pharmacology, Washington University Medical School, St. Louis, "speaking for the scientist"; and Peter B. Hutt, general counsel for the Food and Drug Administration, "speaking for the regulator."

The forum format calls for the speakers to have an opportunity to question each other and to be questioned by a Panel for Inquiry consisting of: Robert McC. Adams, dean, Division of Social Sciences, University of Chicago; Irving M. London, director, MIT-Harvard Program in Health Sciences and Technology; Franklin A. Long, director, Department of Chemistry and Program on Science, Technology, and Society, Cornell; Maclyn McCarty, vice president and physician-in-chief, Rockefeller University, and Philip Morrison, professor of physics, MIT.

The chairman of the program is Daniel E. Koshland Jr., professor of biochemistry, University of California, Berkeley.

Later this year a forum will be held on "The Energy Crisis: Alternatives and Risks," and early next year on "Natural Disasters: Earthquakes, Hurricanes, Floods, and Fire."

array of advisory committees of distinguished scientists who pass judgment on the merits of grant proposals—has not broken fully into the open. But informed sources within HEW told SGR that the department is currently circulating an OMB document "of unusually high sensitivity" which "raises serious questions about peer review," including suggestions that the review panels are self-serving, that they are plagued by personal conflicts of interest, and that they often exert executive authority instead of acting in a purely advisory capacity. There have also been complaints that the review panels are narrow in perspective and that they have proliferated beyond reason and efficiency. Constituent units of HEW, such as NIH and NIMH, have been asked to respond to the OMB document.

When asked to comment on the apparent challenge to peer review, John Sherman, the acting director of NIH, told SGR: "There is no question but what the peer review system is more seriously challenged now than at any time previously that I'm aware of. But it's not clear how serious the challenge is or whence it emanates." Sherman added that "we regard peer review as a life and death matter." The chief defense generally offered of the peer review system is that it has resulted in high quality research and has given the scientific community confidence that grant awards are being made on the basis of professional merit rather than political or personal preferences.

At this point it is not clear who will decide the fate of the peer review system. But if Charles C. Edwards, the new assistant secretary for health in HEW, has much say in the matter, it seems likely that peer review will be retained while the number of review committees will be cut. Edwards told reporters at a press conference on May 4: "If I thought the peer review system were being destroyed, I wouldn't be here." He quickly added that there should be a "good, hard look" at the review system, but he stressed that the Administration couldn't possibly do away with all peer review committees because it lacks the capability to judge grant proposals using inhouse staff alone. However, he suggested that many committees aren't really needed. "We've got peer reviews looking after peer reviews," he said. "We're not going to cut half the committees out but there will be a fair number that we will eliminate."

Meanwhile, an OMB official who specializes in advisory committee issues told SGR he personally has concluded that the peer review system, while far from perfect, is more effective than any of the alternatives he has heard proposed.

Thus the prognosis for peer review is cloudy. But the most likely outcome is retention of the present system coupled with reductions in its size.—PMB.

NSF Patent Shift to Benefit Universities

The National Science Foundation is on the verge of announcing a major change in its patent policies that will allow qualifying institutions to be guaranteed in advance the royalties from faculty inventions that result from projects supported by NSF.

The new policy will also remove limitations previously imposed on the amount of royalties that could go to the individual inventor, thus opening the possibility that both the inventor and his institution can reap greater financial rewards from NSF-sponsored research.

The changes at NSF are generally in line with the thrust of recommendations made by an interagency group operating under the Federal Council for Science and Technology (FCST). That group, known as the University Subcommittee on Patent Policy, has been studying ways to overcome barriers to technology transfer between the universities and industry.

According to Norman J. Latker, chief of HEW's patent branch and chairman of the subcommittee, the FCST group concluded it is "essential" that the government persuade universities to develop a management capability for transferring the inventions emerging from university research to those industrial concerns most likely to use the results. The inducement proposed by the subcommittee—and still under review within FCST—is that the government might, at the time it awards research funds, guarantee patent rights to any university that can demonstrate the requisite management capability.

That's essentially what NSF now proposes to do. Under a new policy that has been approved by the Foundation's policy-making National Science Board but has not yet been made public, NSF will be authorized to "enter into separate institutional agreements with academic or other nonprofit organizations which are capable of aggressively promoting the use of inventions and have competent patent counsel available and an active ongoing program of patent management." Such agreements may provide that all inventions made under NSF awards belong to the institution, subject to certain limitations, and they will require that the institution use any net royalty income "for the support of education or scientific research." The government will retain the right to use the invention without paying royalties.

Previously, the Foundation had generally determined patent rights on a "deferred determination" basis—that is, after an invention had emerged, NSF and the institution would negotiate over who owned the patent rights. Although NSF generally granted patent rights to most universities that requested them, the situation produced uncertainty in university and industry circles and is said

to have hampered efforts to bring about closer collaboration between the two spheres.

The chief reason for the new policy, according to NSF counsel Charles F. Brown, is that the universities are generally in a better position than NSF to promote the use of their inventions. "We don't have the staff to sell licenses effectively," he told SGR. Moreover, since NSF's mission is to support research and education, Brown said, the Foundation considers it "socially desirable" for universities to be able to obtain income from

(Continued on page 5)

Some Academic Patent "Biggies"

Interviews with patent officials at major universities indicate that royalty income can be a valuable supplementary source of revenue. And, if a university is lucky enough to spawn what the trade calls a "biggie," the returns can be quite substantial.

Consider these winners in recent decades:

—A memory core used in computers, which was invented by MIT's Jay W. Forrester, will gross about \$19 million in royalties by the time final payments are made in the near future. MIT will net about \$14 million of that, with the rest going to Forrester, The Research Corporation and litigation costs.

—A semi-synthetic penicillin developed at MIT has netted the institute about \$5 million to date (from gross royalties of \$11 million) while a patent related to the synthesis of Vitamin A netted MIT \$2.2 million (from gross royalties of \$5 million) between 1950 and 1964.

—The Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation netted about \$8 million in royalties between 1928 and 1945 from an irradiation process for creating Vitamin D. The Foundation's total net royalties from all inventions between 1928 and 1972 were \$12.9 million.

—Stanford has netted about \$3.5 million since 1937 from royalties on the klystron, a microwave tube used in radar, communications, and missile tracking.

—The University of California, which has had no big hits, earned royalties of about \$200,000 last year on its portfolio of some 100 inventions.

Other universities which have produced commercially profitable inventions include the Indiana University Foundation, which licensed the additive stannous fluoride to Procter & Gamble for use in Crest toothpaste (insiders say the university made a naively bad deal with the company on that one); and the University of Florida, which is sharing in the royalties from Gatorade, a quick-energy drink.

Kennedy's S.32 Linked to Bigger State Role in R&D

Little has been heard of Senator Kennedy's far-reaching National Science Policy and Priorities Act (S. 32) since it overwhelmingly passed the Senate last year and foundered in committee in the House. But the bill—whose centerpiece is a NASA-style agency, attached to NSF, for promoting civilian technology—is stirring again as the result of Kennedy's deferential gesture to Senator Peter H. Dominick, of Colorado, the ranking Republican on the Labor and Public Welfare NSF subcommittee, which Kennedy chairs.

Taking a cue from the administration, which has become enamored of the notion that state governments should become more heavily involved in the support and application of science and technology, Dominick indicated to Kennedy that he would support S. 32 if he were first permitted to introduce a bill to promote state involvement. Kennedy agreed, and last week, Dominick introduced S. 1686, which calls for giving each state \$100,000 to pay for, on an 80-20 basis, a governor's science and technology advisor. In conjunction with this the country would be divided into 10 "standard regions," each of which would provide two members for an NSF-based Intergovernment Science and Technology Advisory Council. The Council would also include the director of NSF and the director of the congressional Office of Technology Assessment.

The Council, Dominick said in introducing his bill, "would assist the (NSF) Director in the setting of national R&D priorities and in finding ways to facilitate the transfer and utilization of R&D results from the Federal to the local level."

Finally, states that appoint science and technology advisers would be eligible to apply for an "intergovernmental science and technology grant," individually or on a regional basis. The bill proposes the authorization of grants totaling \$25 million starting next July 1, and \$50 million the following year to pay 80 percent of the cost "of applying science and technology to such civilian needs in the State or region as health care, poverty, public services, public safety, pollution, housing, education, transportation, or energy resources."

With the Dominick bill in the hopper, Kennedy plans to hold hearings on S. 32, probably early in June. The House Science and Astronautics Committee, which held quick and skimpy hearings on the bill last fall, is waiting to see how things come out in the Senate before taking up the measure, which, in the House, bears the designation H.R. 178, introduced by Rep. John Davis (D-Ga.), chairman of the subcommittee that would hold hearings.

One of the principal criticisms of the Kennedy concept is that NSF, with its basic research origins, is an unsuitable base for an applied science agency.

Some close associates of the Senator readily agree, but they point out that if NSF is not in the picture, Kennedy loses jurisdiction over the measure, since the Foundation is the only science-related agency within his subcommittee jurisdiction that is remotely related to civilian technology activities that Kennedy wishes to promote.

NSF and Endowment Programs to Aid Research on Science Ethics

Scholarly handwringing over the social and ethical implications of science and technology has now been certified for government support and is to be the beneficiary of parallel grant programs administered by the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities. In both organizations, funds will be made available from general appropriations, depending upon what the mail brings and how much can be wrested from the activities of other claimants.

At NSF, the program bears the title of Ethical and Human Value Implications of Science and Technology. In charge is Charles Maechling, a special assistant to the NSF Director; address: NSF, Washington, D.C. 20550.

At the Endowment, the program is titled Knowledge and Human Values, and the chief, bearing the title of coordinator, is Richard Hedrich; address: National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C. 20506.

The recommended first step for applicants is to send a preliminary draft to either or both agencies, depending on the researcher's assessment of whether science, humanities, or both are central to the topic.

The first grants will be made in the next fiscal year, which starts July 1.

According to an announcement from the Endowment, "The compass of the new program will be related to both technology assessment and environmental impact, but will be more specialized than either in its concentration on cultural and humanistic values. Support will be extended to research or other scholarly work, conferences, colloquia, and similar activities."

Weinberg Rumored on Way Out as Oak Ridge Chief

Persistent reports that attempts are being made to oust Alvin M. Weinberg as director of the AEC's Oak Ridge National Laboratory gained credence recently when Weinberg acknowledged to SGR that he is currently on a leave of absence that is not entirely of his own choosing.

Weinberg, who is one of the most renowned scientist-administrators in the nation, announced unexpectedly on January 18 that he was taking a leave of absence on Feb. 1 that would last "several months" and would be devoted primarily to "writing and lecturing." That same day he left for a vacation in Florida.

The abrupt announcement surprised the Oak Ridge staff and led to rumors that the AEC was pressuring the Union Carbide Corp. Nuclear Division, which operates the laboratory under contract with the AEC, to remove Weinberg as director. The rumors increased when the AEC procrastinated in beginning negotiations toward extending its contract with Union Carbide beyond the June 30 expiration date of the current contract.

SGR queried Weinberg about the rumors late in April as he was in the midst of a lecture tour of several colleges in Virginia. "That's an interesting theory," he replied. "I guess I hadn't quite heard it."

Is he being pushed out? "I expect to be back at the laboratory sometime in the fall," he replied. "Beyond that, there is nothing more that I have to say."

What about his leave? Was that his idea? Or did someone force him to take it?

"A great deal of it was my idea," he replied.

Well, could he say who else's idea it was? "No," he replied. "There's really nothing more that I'm in a position to say."

Weinberg then suggested that SGR might direct its inquiries to such parties as the AEC or Union Carbide. A spokesman for Union Carbide's nuclear division said his management expected Weinberg to return in the fall. A spokesman for the AEC said he had "nothing to add" to Carbide's position. And Floyd L. Culler, who is serving as acting director of the laboratory in Weinberg's absence, said he expected Weinberg to return in the fall. Meanwhile, Alexander Hollaender, a distinguished colleague of Weinberg's, told us: "Rumors are flying around. That's about all I know of it."

Those who believe Weinberg is under pressure to leave cite two possible reasons for an ouster attempt. One is that Weinberg has been outspokenly critical of the AEC for its emphasis on the liquid metal fast breeder reactor at the expense of other breeder designs and for its handling of the safety issues concerning the emergency core cooling systems for light water reactors. The second reason is that Weinberg may not fit the

AEC's new notion that its laboratory directors should be hard-nosed managers. In this sense, the Weinberg case may reflect the same forces which led to the dismissal of an incumbent director at Argonne National Laboratory last fall. (SGR, Vol. II, Nos. 15 and 17).

Weinberg has been the director at Oak Ridge since 1955. He is a member of the NAS and has gained a reputation for astute commentary on public policy issues involving science and technology. He is devoting his leave to extensive lecturing and the preparation of a book dealing with "Science and Trans-Science." "I'm working my ass off," he told SGR.

PATENTS (*Continued from page 3*)

patent royalties that can be applied to those purposes. Such income can be substantial (see box, page 3.)

Brown estimated that perhaps 30 to 40 institutions have the management capability to qualify under the new policy. Currently most universities either leave it up to faculty members to seek their own patents or contract with outside organizations, such as The Research Corporation, of New York, to handle patents and licensing. But many universities with large research volumes have set up special offices or related foundations which screen the faculty for patentable ideas and then aggressively try to sell those ideas to industry.

The second major change in NSF's patent policy was to remove a restriction that the individual inventor, who generally shares in the royalties with his institution, could receive only 15 percent of the gross royalties. Brown said the original reason for imposing the limitation was to keep investigators focused on basic research rather than concentrating on profits. But since NSF's basic research orientation has been "seriously eroded" by new applied programs, he said, "we figured it didn't make much difference" if the limitation was dropped. Brown noted that some schools, such as the University of California, award the inventor up to 50 percent, and thus manage to flush out a lot more ideas than would otherwise emerge.

A few other agencies already have policies similar to the impending policy at NSF. Latker said in a recent speech that both HEW and the Defense Department guarantee qualifying institutions a first option to administer inventions generated with government support. And he reported that NASA is "willing to entertain" requests for such institutional agreements. Those three agencies plus NSF, he noted, provide about \$2 billion of the \$3 billion in federal support for university research. As Latker expressed it, the concept "is here to stay and grow because it basically reflects a grass-roots desire."

Medical Schools Seen Facing New Budgetary Crisis

President Nixon's proposed budget for fiscal 1974 will have a "devastating effect" upon the scientific competence of the nation's medical schools, according to a survey conducted by the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC).

Results of the survey—covering 78 schools which enroll 70 percent of the nation's medical students—have not been officially released, but a draft of the findings has been obtained by SCR. The thrust of the 31-page document is that budget cuts imposed by the Nixon administration will seriously impair the ability of medical schools to maintain a high level of research, education, and services.

That's not a surprising finding since one purpose of the survey was to demonstrate the need for increased biomedical funding. But the importance of the publication is that it provides the first broad-scale documentation of the impact of the Nixon budget cuts at the grass roots level.

The report describes the budget in such terms as "disastrously small" and it warns that the momentum of scientific research "may be irretrievably lost."

Under the Administration's proposed budget, federal support for research at the 78 schools would drop 10 percent from the levels in fiscal 1973, the current year. Funding of new projects would be cut even more—by 40 percent from 1972 levels. The scientific strength of the medical schools will also be eroded, according to the survey, by the proposed phase-out of graduate research training programs. The report said this phase-out "will have a devastating effect upon the basic and clinical science departments and their effectiveness," thereby threatening the scientific soundness of the education given all doctors, as well as reducing the supply of trained researchers.

The survey also concluded that:

—The 78 schools will have to lay off, or find other means to support, some 1,400 faculty members currently supported by federal funds. That's one of every 12 faculty members. Junior faculty will be the first to go.

—Supporting staff will have to be cut by 15 percent from current levels.

—One-third of the schools face the "strong possibility" of being forced to reduce the size of future entering classes.

—Curricular improvement programs may have to be curtailed at a majority of the schools.

—Half the schools may be forced to curtail health care programs in rural or ghetto areas, continuing education for physicians, and referral services in cancer, heart disease, and other critical areas.

—Lack of construction funds will cause "acute" problems at new and developing institutions.

Marston Farewell Talk Hits Administration Policy

The Nixon administration's health research policies were likened to those of a "jackass" by ousted NIH director Robert Q. Marston in a farewell address to his NIH colleagues on April 27.

As the audience applauded his remarks, Marston made it clear that he opposes many of the major thrusts of the Nixon program. He stopped just short of accusing the Administration of destroying NIH, but he quoted with apparent approval two individuals who have made such charges.

One was Hudson Hoagland, director of the Worcester Foundation, who recently wrote: "It has taken a quarter century to build up the National Institutes of Health . . . It is truly one of the great achievements of American government but it is being destroyed."

The other was Rep. William R. Roy (D-Kan.), a member of the House health subcommittee, who recently commented: "Any jackass can kick down a barn but it takes a carpenter to build one."

Marston reaffirmed his "strong support" for many of the programs which the biomedical community fears are being jeopardized by the Administration's budgetary and administrative policies. He endorsed the training-grant programs, the peer review system, the support of basic research "and particularly the principle that applied research should not be expanded at the expense of basic research," and the need for "a balanced biomedical research program—for example, cancer research should not be increased at the expense of other fields of biomedical science."

Although he stopped just short of saying so, Marston also hinted that the Administration is yielding to what he called "the temptation to misuse science for its own political ends." He noted that this country has so far seen a "minimum of attempts to bend science to meet short-term political needs," but he said a "major check on such temptations" has been the peer review system. Yet this system, he noted, is now being accused of special interest advocacy and disloyalty. "Such a misunderstanding could result in what has been feared in other countries," he said, ". . . a distortion of truth—a substitution of bias for objectivity."

Marston, a holdover from the Johnson administration who was asked to resign after Nixon's landslide victory in November, and who formally did so in January, will be taking a sabbatical year as a scholar-in-residence at the University of Virginia and a distinguished fellow at the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences.

Watergate Paralysis Slows R&D Decision Making

The spreading Watergate scandal is yet to set off any secondary explosions in the federal agencies that are predominantly concerned with research. But Nixon's post-election concentration of power in the White House, and the subsequent disintegration of the presidential staff, have created a decision-making paralysis that is subtly but steadily spreading to agencies far remote from current headline events.

The malady defies precise assessment, but in the words of a key staff member of the fast-fading White House Office of Science and Technology, "Just about everything that the President set out in his Science and Technology Message 14 months ago requires some sort of approval at the White House level now and then, and there's no one to talk to there."

The Message, for example, designated that most elephantine of federal agencies, the Commerce Department, as the "focal point for policy development concerning industrial R&D." But Commerce itself is in an especially great state of disarray as the result of the scandal-related resignation of Jeb Stuart Magruder, whom Nixon installed as director of the Department's Office of Policy Development.

Specific authority for the R&D role was assigned to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Domestic and International Business, but that post has been vacant since last January. Newly arrived in the long-vacant post of Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology is Betsy Ancker-Johnson, a Boeing executive, who, if the experience of her predecessors is any measure, will need at least a year to learn her way around—before concluding that the job is hopeless.

Meanwhile, over at the Atomic Energy Commission, the problems of communicating with the devastated White House are compounded by the uncertainties of what lies ahead for the AEC. Nixon's energy message of last month stated that Congress would soon receive a refurbished proposal for creating a Department of Energy and Natural Resources, which, by all accounts, would include the AEC's civilian power programs. Details presumably are being worked out by the newly created White House National Energy Office, which is off and running and apparently uncontaminated by Watergate and associated matters. But the Energy Office, a low-level entity in the White House, has already received some shock waves from the scandal through the resignation of presidential assistant John D. Ehrlichman, whom Nixon had appointed to the three-member Special Committee on Energy which was designed to give political weight to the Office's decisions. The other members are Henry Kissinger, who is said to be deeply depressed these days over Watergate's effects on

the grand international design he has been masterminding for the President, and George P. Shultz, who is in charge of running the Treasury Department, managing the domestic economy, and looking after the dollar abroad.

For the federal science bureaucracy and its clients out there, the difficulties flowing from Watergate are aggravated by the fact that this is a time of transition in the management of the science-government relationship. Come June 30, OST evaporates and many of its responsibilities formally shift over to NSF Director H. Guyford Stever. Whether for good or ill, the change is a change, and necessarily involves the dissolution of longstanding relationships, some of them dating back to early post-Sputnik days. There's a story going around that in the midst of this shift, and with the Watergate confusion in the background, a team of researchers from a major weapons laboratory recently arrived in Washington hoping to obtain a high-level hearing concerning a development that they considered to be of extreme importance. According to a veteran of the old advisory process, "They couldn't find anybody to listen to them, so they went back home."

Stever, who under the reorganization plan will not inherit any of OST's military functions when he becomes Science Adviser, communicates with the White House through channels that have remained miraculously free of Watergate taint. Most of his dealings are with the Office of Management and Budget, which so far is unimplicated, and on truly weighty matters, he reports to George Shultz, through Shultz's White House staff man, Kenneth Dam. The reorganization plan designates Stever as an adviser to the Domestic Council, which was headed by Ehrlichman, but how, if at all, Ehrlichman's downfall affects matters is not clear. Stever's assessment of the situation, as he related it to SGR, is that "everything is normal as far as we're concerned."

That's a cheery report, but it does not match up to what R&D officials throughout the bureaucracy are saying privately.—DSG

Science & Government Report
Kalorama Station, Box 21123B, Washington, D.C. 20009

Renew my subscription for two years, \$65
 Enter my subscription one year, \$35

(Overseas airmail, \$10 additional per year.)

Please bill Check enclosed

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

HEW Revamps Major Health Service Agencies

The Department of HEW announced a major reorganization of its health agencies on May 3, amid signs that NIH and NIMH may be sheared of their service functions and turned into agencies devoted almost entirely to research.

The main thrust of the reorganization—the umpteenth to hit HEW in recent years—is that the Health Services and Mental Health Administration (HSMHA), which was established in 1968 to help unify the administration of health programs, will be split up again, with the result that there will now be five main health units in HEW instead of the existing three.

The impetus for reorganizing HSMHA is that some of its major programs, such as community health centers and the regional medical programs, have been virtually wiped out by the Nixon budget cuts; and the agency has been considered, according to Charles C. Edwards, assistant HEW secretary for health, rather "unmanageable".

For students of organization charts, the new lineup of health agencies looks like this:

—The Food and Drug Administration remains intact.

—The NIH loses its Bureau of Health Manpower Education but gains NIMH, which was formerly part of HSMHA. There is some doubt whether NIMH will remain permanently within NIH, since the transfer was described as "for the time being."

—A new Health Services Administration will be created to absorb HSMHA's health service grant and direct delivery programs.

—A new Health Resources Administration will be created to absorb HSMHA's data gathering and health service demonstration programs, as well as the Bureau of Health Manpower Education.

—The Center for Disease Control, in Atlanta,

which had been part of HSMHA, will become a separate agency and will absorb the National Institute for Occupational Safety.

Harold O. Buzzell, 40, a former vice-president of the management consulting firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton and until recently a Labor Department official, will implement the reorganization and will then become head of the new Health Services Administration, thus becoming the first non-physician in recent memory to be put in charge of federal health services.

The reorganization was justified, as were all of its predecessors, on the grounds that it would increase HEW's effectiveness and efficiency. But the reaction from those elements of the press and scientific community that are familiar with the changes was essentially "ho hum." As Edwards told a press conference, the reorganization "doesn't mean a damn thing to the citizen in Oshkosh."

Perhaps more significant than the reorganization were two related announcements. HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger revealed that he plans to strengthen the policy role of the assistant secretary for health in the Medicare and Medicaid programs, a move which would make Edwards more truly the top health official in government. And Edwards told a press conference that "good hard thought" should be given to splitting off those programs at NIH and NIMH which involve delivery of health services rather than research. The only examples he cited were the alcoholism and drug abuse programs at NIMH and the cancer control program at NIH. Changes in such programs would generally require Congressional approval. The move would probably be welcomed by many NIH officials who have long opposed an NIH role in delivery of services.

Science & Government Report
Kalorama Station
Box 21123
Section B
Washington, D.C. 20009

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

NEWSLETTER—
Please expedite delivery directly to addressee

